

## REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on February 25, 2005 in which Claims 20-29 were allowed; in which Claims 3-19, 31-32, and 34-37 were objected to; and in which Claims 1, 2, 30 and 33 were rejected. With this response, Claims 1, 21-24, 31 and 33 are amended and Claims 38-40 are added. Claims 1-40 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Rejection of Claims 1 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Based Upon Tazawa.

Page 2 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tazawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,394,010. Claim 1, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Tazawa. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 30 based upon Tazawa be withdrawn.

A. Claim 1.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a circuit board assembly which includes a circuit board, an electronic component, a plurality of incremental detents coupled to one of the circuit board and the electronic component, and at least one projection coupled to the other of the circuit board and the electronic component. At least one projection is configured to be selectively received within at least a selected one of the plurality of detents to adjust and retain a spacing of the electronic component relative to the circuit board along the first axis.

Tazawa fails to disclose or suggest a circuit board assembly which includes a plurality of incremental detents and a projection which is configured to be selectively received within at least a selected one of the plurality of detents to adjust and retain a spacing of the electronic component relative to the circuit along an axis. In contrast, Tazawa merely discloses recess 19a and projection 19b "for positional alignment which can fit into associated projection recess of other containers." (col. 3, lines 5-6). Projections 19b are not configured to be selectively received within at least one of recesses 19a to adjust and retain a spacing of an electronic component

relative to a circuit board. Rather, projections 19b must be fit within a corresponding recess 19a to align the positions of the containers of Tazawa rather than to adjust a spacing of an electronic component relative to a circuit board. Accordingly, Claim 1, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Tazawa.

B. Claim 30.

Claim 30 recites a circuit board assembly which includes a circuit board assembly which includes a circuit board, an electronic component and means for adjustably positioning relative to the circuit board in both directions along an axis and maintaining the electronic component relative to the circuit board against linear movement in both directions along the axis.

Tazawa fails to disclose or suggest any such means for adjustably positioning electronic component relative to the circuit board in both directions along an axis. In contrast, Tazawa merely discloses the projections 19b which must be fit into corresponding recesses 19a to align containers 10. Nowhere does Tazawa disclose or suggest that recesses 19a and projections 19b may be used to adjust the positioning of containers 10 relative to one another in both directions along a single axis. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 30 based upon Tazawa be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 30 and 33 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Based Upon Johnson.

Page 2 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-2, 30 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,321,423. Claims 1 and 33, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Johnson. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 30 based upon Johnson be withdrawn.

A. Claim 1.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a circuit board assembly which includes a circuit board, an electronic component, a plurality of incremental detents coupled to one of the circuit board and the electronic component, and at least one projection coupled to the other of the circuit board and the electronic component. At least one projection is configured to be selectively received within at least a selected one of the plurality of detents to adjust and retain a spacing of the electronic component relative to the circuit board along the first axis.

Johnson fails to disclose or suggest a circuit board assembly having a plurality of incremental detents and at least one projection configured to be selectively received within at least a selected one of the plurality of detents to adjust and retain a spacing of the electronic component relative to the circuit board along an axis. In contrast, Johnson discloses bolts 9 and 10 which appear to retain heat sink 6 against circuit board 8. Bolts 9 and 10 cannot be rotated to adjust a spacing between electronic component 7 and printed circuit board 8. First, bolts 9 and 10 are described as being soldered in place. Moreover, even assuming, arguendo, that such soldering were omitted, rotation of such bolts 9 and 10 would merely result in the heads of bolts 9 and 10 rising above electronic component 7 rather than moving electronic component 7 to a different spacing relative to circuit board 8. Accordingly, Claim 1, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Johnson. Claim 2 depends from Claim 1 and overcomes the rejection for the same reasons.

B. Claim 30.

Claim 30 recites a circuit board assembly which includes a circuit board assembly which includes a circuit board, an electronic component and means for adjustably positioning relative to the circuit board in both directions along an axis and maintaining the electronic component relative to the circuit board against linear movement in both directions along the axis.

Johnson fails to disclose or suggest means for adjustably positioning an electronic component relative to a circuit board in both directions along an axis. In contrast, Johnson merely discloses bolts 9 and 10 which are soldered in place to printed circuit board 8. Even assuming, that bolts 9 and 10 were not soldered, rotation of bolts 9 and 10 would merely result in the heads of such bolts rising above component 7 and would not result in the spacing between component 7 and printed circuit board 8 being adjusted. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 30 based upon Johnson be withdrawn.

C. Claim 33.

Claim 33, as amended, recites a method for mounting an electronic component to a circuit board. The method includes positioning at least one projection within at least one of a plurality of incremental detents extending an axis. The method also includes repositioning the at least one projection and the at least one incremental detent relative to one another to adjust a spacing between the electronic component and the circuit board.

Johnson fails to disclose or suggest a method in which at least one projection and at least one incremental detent are repositioned relative to one another to adjust a spacing between an electronic component and a circuit board. As noted above, bolts 9 and 10 of Johnson are described as being soldered in place and cannot be adjusted relative to the threaded bolts of heat sink 6. Moreover, even assuming, arguendo, that the bolts could be rotated, this would merely result in the heads of bolts 9 and 10 being spaced further from printed circuit board 8. This would not result in the spacing between electronic component 7 and printed circuit board 8 being adjusted. Accordingly, Claim 33, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Johnson.

III. Added Claims.

With this response, Claims 38-40 are added. Claims 38-40 are presented for consideration and allowance.

A. Claim 38.

Added Claim 38 depends from Claim 20 which has been allowed. Added Claim 38 recites additional limitations which further patentably distinguish the unit of Claim 20 over the prior art of record. Thus, Claim 38 is presented for consideration and allowance.

B. Claim 39.

Page 3 of the Office Action indicated that Claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In response, Claim 17 is rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the former base Claim 1 and intervening Claims 2, 3 and 4. Thus, added Claim 39 is presented for consideration and allowance.

C. Claim 40.

Page 3 of the Office Action indicated that Claim 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In response, Claim 19 is rewritten as added Claim 40 and includes all of the limitations of former base Claim 1. Accordingly, added Claim 40 is presented for consideration.

IV. Conclusion.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-40 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit

any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 25, 2005 By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22879  
Telephone: (414) 297-5710  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,276